

**REMARKS IN REPLY TO THE NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT
DATED NOVEMBER 25, 2009**

A Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (“Notice”) dated November 25, 2009 identifies the previously-filed Amendment (filed October 16, 2009 and responsive to the Office Action dated May 18, 2009) as being non-compliant for including improper status identifiers for certain claims. In particular, the Notice identifies the status identifier, “Presently Presented,” as being improper.

Applicants inadvertently included “Presently Presented” as the status identifier for claims 139, 164, 165, and 173 in the previously-filed Amendment. By the present Amendment, Applicants correct the status identifiers for these claims to be “Previously Presented.” Other than correcting the status identifiers, the above claim amendments and the following remarks are identical to those included in the previous Amendment filed October 16, 2009. Favorable reconsideration and entry of the present Amendment are respectfully requested.

REMARKS IN REPLY TO THE OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 18, 2009

Prior to entry of the present Amendment, claims 133, 134, 136-142, 144-150, and 152-189 are pending. By the present Amendment, claims 133, 134, 136-138, 140-142, 144-150, 152-163, 166-172, 174-179, and 181-189 are amended.

Status of Pending Claims

The Office Action Summary, on page 1 of the Office Action dated May 18, 2009, indicates that all of the pending claims are rejected. Applicants note that the Office Action provides reasons for rejecting claims 133, 134, 136-138, 140-142, 144-146, 148-150, 152-154, 156-172, 174-179, 181-186, 188, and 189 only. Accordingly, Applicants request that the statuses of claim 139, 147, 155, 173, 180, and 187, for which no reasons for rejection were given, be correctly indicated in any future Office Action.

Objection to the Specification

The specification of the above-identified application is objected to for allegedly including a recitation of “are set up, and a query mechanism is generated.” (See Office Action, page 11, line 10.) Applicants respectfully traverse this objection.

First, Applicants note that there is no recitation on page 11, line 10 beginning with the words “are set up . . .” Applicants believe that the Office Action intended to cite to page 14, line 21, which includes the text “are set up . . .” A copy of page 14 of the specification of the above-identified application, as filed, is attached to the present Amendment as Exhibit 1.

Referring to Exhibit 1, Applicants note that page 14, line 21 includes the text “are set up, **and** a query mechanism is generated.” (Emphasis added.) The word “and” does not appear in this copy of page 14 of the specification. Applicants, therefore, respectfully traverse this objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112

Claims 133, 134, 136-138, 140-142, 144-146, 148-150, 152-154, 156-172, 174-179, 181-186, 188, and 189 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. By the present Amendment, Applicants amend these claims and several other claims not identified in the rejection to clarify the features of the claims. Withdrawal of the rejections and favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

With regard to claim 133, the Office Action asserts that “[i]t is unclear, vague, and indefinite as to what “‘instructions’ are being referenced” in the claim. (See Office Action, page 3.) The Office Action asks whether Applicants “mean ‘instructions for generating one or more database systems.’” (See Office Action, page 3.) By the present Amendment, Applicants amend claim 133 to include a recitation of “for generating a database system for business from a user” following the recitation of “instructions” recited in the step of “receiving.” Withdrawal of the rejection and favorable reconsideration and allowance of claim 133 are respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 134, the Office Action asserts that the recitation of “generating tables automatically according to the instructions” is “unclear, vague, and indefinite because it cannot be determined what instructions are being referenced.” (See Office Action, page 3.) By the present Amendment, Applicants amend claim 134 to insert a recitation of “received” prior to the recitation of “instructions” in the claim. Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 134 clearly refers to the “instructions” recited in the step of “receiving” in claim 133. Withdrawal of the rejection and favorable reconsideration and allowance of claim 134 are respectfully requested.

By the present Amendment, Applicants also amend claims 136-138, 140-142, 144-150, 152-163, 166-172, and 174-179, and 181-189 similarly to claims 133 and/or 134 or to add recitations of “software” or other clarifying language. Support for these amendments may be found throughout the above-identified application. Withdrawal of the rejections and favorable reconsideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

Finally, the Office Action requests that Applicants identify “where a business database system is found in the specification.” (See Office Action, page 3.) Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner’s attention to page 14 of the specification, copy enclosed as Exhibit 1, which describes:

System Element Descriptions

The following describes the metadata 160, then the other elements of the system 100, and finally, the elements that are external to the system 100. These elements are all described in greater detail below.

Metadata Overview

The metadata 160 includes many different types of data and information. This information can be broken down into information related to (1) the definition of the schema for the datamart 150, (2) the data needed during the extraction from the source systems 110 and loading of the datamart 150, and (3) the information used in the querying of the datamart 150 and supplying the result sets. The relationships between the elements of the metadata 160 are described in greater detail below. However, the following provides brief descriptions of these elements.

The schema definitions 161 hold the definition of the schema for the datamart 150. Typically, a consultant, using the consultant computer 190, can interface with the enterprise manager 102 to define the schema definition 161 for the datamart 150. In particular, the consultant can use the enterprise manager interface 192 to define a star schema for the datamart 150. **This star schema is organized around the business processes of the business for which the datamart is being created. . . .** (Emphasis added.)

Applicants also note that the above-identified application defines a “datamart” as “a database.” (See Application, page 11, line 17.) Thus, because the above-identified application describes a “business for which the datamart is being created” and because a datamart is a database, Applicants respectfully assert that the above-identified application describes a “database system for business” as recited throughout the pending claims. Withdrawal of the rejections and favorable of reconsideration and allowance of claims 133, 134, 136-138, 140-142, 144-146, 148-150, 152-154, 156-172, 174-179, 181-186, 188, and 189 are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter on page 4 of the Office Action. Allowance of the Application is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully assert that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of the fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 02-2555.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 14, 2009

/Peter K. Zacharias/

Peter K. Zacharias

Registration No. 62,204

Enclosures: Exhibit 1 (2 pages)

Blank Rome LLP
One Logan Square
18th & Cherry Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-569-5718